

VOICE OF FREEDOM.

VOL. V.

J. HOLCOMB & D. S. MURRAY, PUBLISHERS.

BRANDON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1843.

NO. 16.

D. S. MURRAY, PRINTER.

THE VOICE OF FREEDOM.

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT BRANDON, VERMONT.

JESSE H. HOLCOMB, Editor.

TERMS.—One dollar and fifty cents in advance.

One dollar and seventy-five cents in six months.

Two dollars during the last quarter. All letters relative to the paper should be directed to Holcomb & Murray.

POETRY.

Anti-Slavery Hymn.—A Parody.

Am.—From Greenland's Icy Mountains.

From Plymouth's rock of story,
From Concord's hill of blood,
Through many a woodland, hoary,
O'er many a rolling flood;
O'er old plains scarred with battle,
By old stories told with prayer,
The sounds of conflict rattle—
And yet no sword is there.

But like a clarion, loudly,
O'er scorched hill and glen,
The call is swelling proudly
From the deep hearts of men—
Up, up from hill and valley,
From river, shore and sea,
Let all the people rally,
The bleeding slave to free!

So host with host assembling,
The victory shall win;
Let on his throne sit trembling,
The tyrant, in his sin;
Like foam by strong winds scattered,
In the 1-les his strength hath gone,
His iron yoke lies shattered,
And still the cry is—"On!"

Our Father, God! our keeper,
Be thou, our strength divine;
Thou sendest forth the reaper,
The harvest all is thine;
Roll on, roll on this glad day,
Till o'er every shore,
The Lord and tears of gladness
Shall stain the earth no more!

W. G. R.

Oct. 1843.

LEWIS TAPPAN'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Tappan delivered an address at Classical Hall, Brooklyn, some days since, in which he gave an account of his recent visit to London, he being one of the delegation to the "World's Convention" from the United States. From the report of the *Express* we extract the following:

Pennington, the black preacher.—Mr. Pennington, of Hartford, Conn., who is one of the blackest men I ever saw, was invited to make a speech, and did so. He sat in the meeting beside Lord Morpeth. In his speech he said every thing in the right manner, and in the right way, and Lord Morpeth, in returning thanks, said he did so in particular for the speech of "our colored brother," as he called him, which speech he said convinced him that such people could adorn any situation that they were called upon to fill. One of the London papers said that the speech of Mr. Pennington was the second best made at Exeter Hall that day, and they did not know but that it was better than even Lord Morpeth's. Mr. Pennington went over to England in the steerage of a ship, not being able to procure a passage in the cabin, but was invited during the voyage by the passengers and officers into the cabin to preach for them. One little incident occurred which will show the estimation in which he was held in London. I was invited, with the other members of the United States delegation, to the house of the celebrated Mrs. Opie, now about seventy years of age, and the authoress of many excellent works. She said she had received a letter. It was from Brother Pennington. He said that he was very sorry that he could not be one of the party, but having made twelve anniversary addresses since his arrival in London, and being engaged every night, he could not accept the invitation, but hoped he would be able to pay his respects to her before he left. (Applause.)

I was invited to a charter meeting, in which were several principal men. The English women love to be at such meetings, and they have soirees to breakfast and tea, at which the women as well as men assemble, and take great interest in the political addresses delivered. While one of the members of Parliament was speaking, a waiter cried out in a stentorian voice, "the Rev Mr. Pennington, from the United States." "This is the usual way of announcing where any distinguished personage arrives. They had probably seen him at Exeter Hall, and considered him entitled to the attention. He came in and took his seat beside the chairman. Another high mark of distinction was shown to him. The University of London has conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, so that although the humble Rev. James W. C. Pennington went out in the steerage of a

ship, he comes back "The Right Rev. Dr. Pennington." I believe the Rev. Dr. Cox was instructed in the conversion and bringing out of this talented man.

Lord Brougham.—While in London, I went to see Lord Brougham. He is a great curiosity—a great literary man, possessing unbounded and versatile talent. But this moral power is not great, owing to this versatility. I perceived in one of the windows of London a caricature, in which he was represented as one of those little dancing Jacks, and Lord Wellington had hold of the string, making him kick in every direction, and underneath was written the words—"a man that kicks every way." This is, politically and generally speaking, about a fair representation of the man, as he kicks frequently at friends as well as foes. I passed nearly an hour with him. He has a very singular way of interrupting people when they are talking to him. Soon after I commenced speaking on the subject of my errand, he stopped me abruptly by saying "where is Monroe Edwards?" he tried to get £50 out of me when he was here." He asked me, subsequently, to submit what I had to say to him on paper. A day or two afterwards, being desirous of visiting the House of Peers, he introduced me on the platform of the House.

Quarterly Meeting.—I also visited Mr. Allen, a venerable old man belonging to the Society of Friends. He said he had been for 30 or 40 years engaged in acts of philanthropy. He has had interviews with many of the sovereigns of Europe, and the late Duke of Sussex was very fond of him. I received a note from him addressed to "Arthur Tappan," couched in affecting language, and on parting with him, his manner was friendly and impressive in the extreme.

Thomas Clarkson.—I also had the pleasure of seeing the venerable Thomas Clarkson. He sent for us, and we went in his carriage to his seat near Ipswich. The building in which he lives is an old-fashioned one, with many a ditch. It was built in 1792, the very year in which Columbus discovered America, and is yet in a good state of preservation. It is situated in the midst of a farm of 350 acres belonging to Mr. Clarkson, the whole of which is in a high state of culture. His body is decrepid, but his mind seems to be perfectly good and active, though he is 83 years of age. He told me that he had written 123 works, mostly on anti-slavery, and showed me the original manuscript of an essay on which he had obtained the medal at college, 61 years ago. He said that in order to collect the facts contained in that essay, he was compelled to make much research and inquiry, and he went up to London for that purpose. On his return, he stopped for rest a short time beneath a tree by the road-side, and the weight of sorrows endured by the slaves so bore upon his heart, that he determined to dedicate his future life to the cause of the negro, and for 61 years he had always proved faithful to that determination. He said that a great many misrepresentations came to this country as to the working of emancipation. He also remarked that some advocates of slavery attempted to defend their principles from the pretended example of Abraham! Oh, horror! horror! he said, that they should attempt such a course, and desecrate the name of Abraham thus. He alluded to Genesis 18 and 19. I speak of this, said Mr. T., because I this day received a pamphlet from the Post Office, written by the Rev. Leander Kerr, of Missouri, in which this very position is taken.

Mr. Clarkson said to me, "only remove slavery from your country, permit your noble constitution to do its proper work, and you will be the glory of all mankind." He got me to read a letter which he had written to John Q. Adams, full of kindness and philanthropy, and bidding him farewell, perhaps forever, as to the concerns of this world. He was carried to the foot of his staircase, when he turned round and said, "Gentlemen, bless you—you do not know what pleasure you have given me." He then crawled, without assistance, up stairs, and that is the last we shall ever see of that virtuous and noble philanthropist. When we came to see his wife, we beheld, in some measure, the cause of his

success. She is a remarkable woman, about ten years younger than her husband, and has the sole care of the farm. She showed us round it, and also carried us to the resting-place of their favorite son, on which there is a handsome monument.

Father Matthew.—I also met a man who knew Father Matthew in Cork, and who was a temperance man and an abolitionist. He told me that Father Matthew was pastor of a Catholic church in Cork. He appears to be a good man. There was a man named William Martin residing in his neighborhood, who got him to read some of the temperance papers, and subsequently to take the temperance pledge. He then commenced preaching temperance and getting the members of his flock to take the pledge—which increased to other individuals, and in a short time it required all his time to administer the pledge. He went to Limerick, a short distance from Cork, for the purpose of administering the pledge, expecting to find about 500 people there, instead of which 200,000 had collected, all anxious to have the pledge administered to them. Father Matthew was overpowered with the excess of his happy emotions. He said it was the Lord's doing, and there was no greater proof of it than his having selected such a humble individual as himself for the task. His Bishop went to him soon afterwards and remonstrated at his departing from the legitimate course of his religious duties. He said—"Don't you know that the publicans in the county do more to sustain our religion than any others?" "Yes," was the reply of Father Matthew. "I do; and I know also that your brother is one of the largest distillers in the county." Father Matthew aware that he would be the object of clerical censure, and perhaps removal, wrote to the Pope at Rome, and got a commission sent back to him as Vicar Apostolic, which took him out of the hands of the Bishops in Great Britain and Ireland. The Pope said to him—"You look to me and I will look to you," so that we have to commend the Pope for one good thing, at any rate. Father Matthew now travels free wherever he chooses to go, as no one thinks of charging him any thing. He has been charged with parsimony in taking a shilling each for medals, but he is not amenable to the censure, as the amount is not more than the cost. He is independent as to pecuniary circumstances, as he enjoys £2000 a year which he inherited from his father, and which for a single man, as from his situation he necessarily is, furnished an abundance for his support.

I saw Father Matthew at Liverpool, and a little party was made up for him to dine with us. Dinner was waiting, but he would not come, because he said if he did, twelve hundred persons would go away without taking the pledge. We went up to the Catholic chapel and saw a number of men and boys crying out and seeing Father Matthew's temperance sermon of the last Sunday. On coming to where Father Matthew was, we found him administering the pledge to sixty and a hundred persons at a time. His mode of doing so was to make them kneel down and repeat the pledge as he pronounced it. I was introduced to him, as from the United States. He took hold of both my hands, and said he was always glad to see any one from the United States, and asked me to Mr. Delavan and others. In 1815, I gave the first pledge in favor of Temperance, but thought on this occasion I might as well renew it, and applied to Father Matthew to that effect. He said he would administer it to me alone, and did so, at the same time giving me his medal.

The hair of Father Matthew is a little gray. He told me that he was about fifty-four years of age. He wears a long surtout which comes about half way between his knees and ankles, and old-fashioned boots over his pantaloons. He shakes hands with so many that his hands and face usually show the effects of it. He is no way particular—kissing the faces of the little children which the mothers hold up to him, whether clean or dirty. He administers the pledge to a large number at once. He then gives them what he calls the sign of the cross, which is a little dab in the forehead, and it is incredible how fast he gets through with them, completing probably thirty in a minute. By request, I then addressed the people, told them my maternal ancestors belonged to Ireland. Hurrah for Ireland, was the loud applause. I then told them that if Father Matthew came to New York, fifty thousand Irishmen would assemble with him in the Park to take the pledge. Hurrah for New York, was the reply. And thus they continued greeting in a good-humored manner what I advanced.

BEER DRINKING.

Mr. Weed, of the Albany Journal, who is now in London, writes as follows of Beer Drinking in England:

Every body drinks Beer in England. I have astonished waiters, in two or three instances, by asking for water. When you seat yourself at table in a "Coffee Room" or "Steak House" for dinner, and have ordered your 'joint' or 'steak,' or 'chop,' the waiter inquires, "Hale, porter, or stout, sir?" If in place of either of these national beverages, you reply water, he either laughs in your face or turns away wondering where such a wild chap could have been caught. Now that I have seen something of English habits, I am astonished that Miss Martineau should have deemed the circumstances that two or three American women with whom she met, were 'not all for love, but a little for the bottle,' worthy of remark. The drinking of hale, porter and stout, is universal here, with the females of the poorer classes, when they can get it, and with those of the better classes of mechanics' females, people and shopkeepers. While at dinner at Birmingham, it was observed by all of us, that the ladies (a dozen) at table, drank porter as if they were thirsty, and as if it did them good. The lady opposite to me, who was well dressed and well educated, disposed of nearly an entire bottle. You meet ladies at every turn of the street in London, the rubicund of whose faces show the shrines at which they kneel. I have met ladies at exhibition Rooms, whose fiery faces entitled them to the distinction of being classed with Shakespeare's 'knights of the burning lamp.' And you find every side-walk blocked up with lusty ladies, who are indebted for their rubicund faces and rotund persons, to habitual beer drinking. I yesterday sat in an omnibus with an old lady and gentleman, evidently of the wealthy class, the latter of whom a victim to gout, while the former displayed a face and nose, the maintenance of which had cost as much as Falstaff paid for 'sack' to keep Bardolph's salamander in the fire.

As a relief to the above picture, the same writer says that profanity is going out of fashion in London. 'Oaths and imprecations so common in America,' he says, 'are not heard here, even among the watchmen, cab-men, coalbearers or scavengers.'

ANTI-SLAVERY.

We copy the following letter, at the special request of several individuals.—Though long, it will richly repay a thorough perusal.

MR. HANKINS'S LETTER.

To Presbyterians, Old and New School, opposed to allowing the practice of slave holding in the Church.

BRETHREN IN THE LORD:

Permit me, as the chairman of a committee appointed for the purpose, to address you on a subject of painful interest. You have doubtless witnessed with deep sensations a manifest determination, in each of the late Assemblies to allow, unapproved, the practice of slaveholding in the church. One Assembly suppressed the right of petition, and even that of discussion, in order to protect the practice of holding human beings as property; the other, after a discussion during three days, in the full blaze of light, not only refused to repudiate the horrible practice, but received two self-constituted slaveholding synods into connexion, without any impelling constitutional obligation. This shows clearly a determination to allow the practice of slaveholding to exist in the church without reproach. The reception of these synods, without constitutional obligation, was an indirect vote that slaveholding is consistent with christian character and profession. Thus while there was an absolute refusal to repudiate slaveholding there was an indirect vote declaring it no sin. The Presbyterian church, ever since, and even before the Assembly formed, has allowed the practice of slaveholding to the great grief of many of her most pious members. And for upwards of twenty years have petitions been before the Assembly asking the action of that body against a practice so derogatory to the christian name, but without success. If any rebuke was given it was covered with a salvo that rendered it abortive.—Never in a single instance has the exercise of discipline been enjoined; and yet there has been no period in which the General Assembly was so ignorant as not to know that slaveholding is the worst form of oppression. The sin of the General Assembly in this respect, has ever been against light. Ever since the introduction of slavery into the country the subject has been so continually discussed that no intelligent body of men could be ignorant of the egregious wrong of making men, women and children property, as if beasts. There is no ground for setting up the plea of ignorance on behalf of any intelligent body of men, in relation to the sinfulness of slavery. Nor, indeed, in behalf of any denomination of professed christians, how ignorant so ever it may be. All the ignorance on that subject has been, and still is, wilful and perverse.

When the late division took place, many took sides with the New School part, because that branch had but little interest in the slave States, and consequently, under least temptation to allow the practice

of slavery, and because that in it was the great body of Presbyterian abolitionists. The prospect appeared to be that of soon becoming an anti-slavery church; but how sad has been the disappointment; no prayers nor efforts have been able to induce the General Assembly to do so much as to say that slaveholding is a sin, while two self-constituted slaveholding synods have been promptly received. The reception of those synods decides what is to be the settled policy of the General Assembly of this branch of the Presbyterian church; and by such reception the motives to this policy are increased. On this subject, in the two Assemblies there is but one policy.

Now, brethren, ought we to adhere to bodies that ever have allowed, and now do allow their members, unreproved, to practise oppression in its worst form, and that can not be induced by any prayers to say that such practice is a sin? To the discussion of this question your attention is now earnestly solicited.

It is but candid to admit, that many plausible things may be said in favor of otherwise; some of these shall now be noticed.

1st. We ought, it is said, to stay in the body, in order to reform it. Ought we not for the same reason to remain with the world, in order to reform it, and not join the churches? When a young man, in a circle of wild and wicked companions, has become regenerated, he should, on this principle remain with them, and not associate himself with the church.—On the same ground the temperance man ought not to come out from his companions and join the temperance society.—Why is it that we are anxious to get the new convert out from his vicious companions? We know he has remaining corruption, and hence we fear their influence. For a similar reason we are anxious to withdraw the reformed drunkard from his companions into a temperance society. Do we not feel alarmed for any professor of religion when we see him closely allied to wicked men? Will not our adherence be more likely to corrupt than to reform the bodies to which we belong? Was not a large part of the Methodist Episcopal Church formerly anti-slavery? But what is now the state of that church? Has not slaveholding influence triumphed over that denomination? And are Abolitionists coming out of it in scattered remnants?

2d. The church, it is said, is an institution of God, and hence, like that of the private family, must not be deserted because the governing power is corrupt and wicked.

In reply to this, it may be asked, is any one denomination of christians the church? Is not the covenant established with Abraham the constitution of the church, and the broad charter of christian privilege? The Bible is but the development of its principles. All societies, formed for the worship of God, founded on Bible principles, are parts of the church. We must depart from Bible ground before we can withdraw from the church. I withdraw my connexion from bodies that allow their members to hold human beings as property, we have little to fear, if the great charter is broad enough to hold us while in such connexion. We have more reason now to look to our feet than we shall have when separated from those who allow the practice of an oppression that ought to make even a Turk blush. In withdrawing, we shall neither change nor leave Presbyterianism. We shall retain Presbyterian government, and every doctrine of the Confession of Faith, without even the least change. The present branches of the Presbyterian church are but voluntary societies. Hence we will stand upon equal ground with them in this respect. In withdrawing from them, we do not leave the church, nor Presbyterianism. We leave those who allow the practice of holding human beings as property, and such as adhere to them. Any society instituted among men is liable to become so corrupt as to justify individuals members in withdrawing from it; nor does even that of the private family form an exception. The conduct of the husband may be so corrupt as to justify the wife in leaving him, and that of parents be such as to justify the withdrawal of the children.

3d. The apostles, it is believed, did not leave the Jewish church, which was as corrupt as any in modern times. Upon investigation this will be found not to be true. While it is admitted that they preached in the synagogues, when allowed, and were sometimes cast out, as predicted by the Savior, yet they never held communion with the Jews. They associated themselves into a separate society, and required profession of faith and baptism in order to union and communion with them. Would they have administered the Lord's Supper to a Jewish synagogue? No fact is more evident than that all the first christian churches were distinct societies that held no communion with the Jews. The same is true of the reformation. The reformers withdrew as churches and individuals from the communion of the papal church, and excluded papists from their communion. Luther, it is true, was excluded; but the protestant churches, in general, withdrew without being excommunicated.

4th. The sin of schism is, it may be said, forbidden as certainly as any other. This is admitted; but then, what is the sin of schism? Certainly it can not consist in withdrawing from brethren that

walk disorderly, for that Paul commanded. The sin of schism consists in dividing the church by the propagation of false doctrines, or by ambitious and wicked measures. There can be no sin in withdrawing from a body that allows the practice in its worst form.

5th. There is, it is said, a prospect of reformation—there is in one body a majority of abolitionists, consequently, sufficient strength to purge out the slaveholding.

But what avail abolitionists who will not do so much as to say slaveholding is a sin? There is an influence exerted by the cities of New-York and Philadelphia that can not be successfully resisted. It perfectly unmans a large proportion of the Assembly. Men who, in other places, act with zeal and efficiency against slavery will not, in Philadelphia, vote that slaveholding is a sin. A minister, who stood by Livejoy when he felt a martyr at Alton, could not breathe so much free air in the atmosphere of Philadelphia as to enable him to say, by vote, that holding human beings as property is a moral evil. In these cities every scheme or plan possible is laid to prevent action on the subject of slavery. The people of New-York and Philadelphia desire the trade of the slave, as well as the free States, and hence the minister of any one of those cities who attacks slavery does it at the hazard both of his bread and his home. A minister of a Presbytery of the city of New-York boasted, at the meeting of the second Constitutional Assembly, that there was not one pastor belonging to his Presbytery an abolitionist.—Now can any one believe this was owing to the want of intellect capable of investigating truth? and if not, why should there be a Presbytery at the fountain-head of discussion without a single pastor an abolitionist? The reason is manifest.—The arguments that tend to separate between us and our bread, and our homes, operate slowly. But for this fact Presbyteries in New-York and Philadelphia would be just as liable to abolitionism as Presbyteries in other places. These cities are the Rome and Constantinople of the churches in America. That there is much piety in these cities, and also many honorable exceptions, is readily admitted, and doubtless the same was true of Rome and Constantinople; but not enough to prevent their bringing moral death upon the church. The influence of the ruling spirits of these cities is extended, just as was the case in Rome and Constantinople, over a large portion of the ministers of the country, and it is of the worst tendency. And there is striking evidence of it in the fact, that while in the New School branch of the Presbyterian church there is a majority of anti-slavery Synods and Presbyteries the General Assembly can not be induced to say that slavery is a sin. The prospect of purging out slavery has been decreasing ever since the first Constitutional Assembly. Slaveholding is increasing in the body; this year two slaveholding Synods have been added, and in their reception is the indirect declaration that slaveholding shall be allowed, and that it is consistent with christian character and profession. Let us not then be deceived with the prospect of purging out slavery—there is no reality in such prospect.

6th. Separation, it is objected, will sunder churches, separate ministers from their charges, and jeopardize church property.

Let it be so. The Savior has said, "if a man forsake not all that he hath he can not be my disciple." If we can not endure divisions, reproach, loss of property and poverty in the cause of righteousness, how should we go to the stake?

7th. Secession, we are reminded, will place us under great disadvantage in point of numbers.

What we lose in numbers we will gain in piety. We shall have the fewer of the class that follow for the loaves and fishes.

There is then no good reason why we should adhere to bodies that do allow their members to practise oppression in its worst form.

It is now time to offer some direct reasons why we should not adhere.

1. Numbers give power and influence to bodies, and it can not in truth be denied that the leading denominations of professed christians are the bulwarks of slavery. The two branches of the Presbyterian church are two of the strongest pillars to prop up the system. These two maintain by the practice and decision upon which the practice is founded, that slaveholding is no sin, and that it is consistent with christian character and profession. Both do openly allow the practice. Now it must be admitted that no other pillar under heaven is equal to this. Can we ever expect the legislatures of the country to act against a system which the church by her practice declares to be consistent with christian character and profession? The New School Presbyterians, a majority being anti-slavery, have, by their representatives in the Assembly, been made to say, in the reception of two slaveholding Synods, that slaveholding is consistent with christian character and profession.—Can it be right for us to build up such bodies and give them strength and influence? While as individuals we act against slavery, we, as parts of the whole body, help to form its strongest pillars. If, instead of laying in our petitions before the Assembly, twenty or thirty years, we had withdrawn. We might by this time, thro' the blessing of God, have had a Presbyterian church, whose moral power and influence would have made the prison-house of bondage tremble to its founda-